

NOTE

On the True Identity of *Zygethobius pontis* Chamberlin  
(Chilopoda: Lithobiomorpha: Henicopidae)

The confident identification of *Zygethobius* (*Zantethobius*) *pontis* Chamberlin, 1911 (Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am. 4(1): 32-48) must prove troublesome to anyone trying to reconcile *pontis* as described in the literature with what one supposes to be *pontis* in nature. In fact, I believe now, *pontis* of the printed page and *pontis* in nature are one and the same in spite of the apparent disparity between them. The source of the long-standing difficulty lies in an error not in Chamberlin's original description but in his later, more comprehensive family revision of 1912 (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. 57(1):1-36).

In 1911 (p. 34) proposing both subgenus *Zantethobius* and species *pontis* as new, Chamberlin separated them from related taxa ascribing to the new subgenus and species tergal productions on body segments 6, 7, 9, 11, and 13. There is no mention of whether or not the 15th tibia has a spinous projection. In 1912 (p. 27) he separated *Zantethobius* and *pontis* again from other taxa, this time specifying "all legs with well-developed tibial processes." On p. 36, again, he attributed a tibial spine to each of the 15th legs and referred to "anal legs" of plate 4, fig. 9. In all other species he believed tibial processes to occur only on legs 1-14, never on 15.

The type-localities of *pontis* are Johnson City, Tennessee, and Natural Bridge, Virginia. For more than 30 years I have examined specimens from the American southeast, especially from Virginia. All agree with Chamberlin's 1912 redescription of *pontis* in every detail except in one: In all of them each 15th tibia lacks a spinous process.

I believe that the types, which cannot be found, had 15th tibiae that had no spinous processes but that such processes did occur upon the 14th and more anterior legs. I suggest that Chamberlin's 1912 figure of a supposed 15th leg was in fact that of a 14th leg. Apart from its possessing a distinct tibial spine, its dimensions and vestiture strengthen this belief. Especially in henicopids the rear legs are easily detached, and when detached they are very easy to confuse with one another.

In summary, I believe that *pontis* in fact lacks a tibial spine on leg 15. Secondly, I find the subgenus *Zantethobius* untenable alone on the basis of its possession of a produced 6th tergite. Its type-species is *pontis* (by monotypy), which is clearly congeneric with *dolichopus* Chamberlin, the type-species of *Zygethobius* (original designation). Accordingly, *Zantethobius* Chamberlin, 1911, is a junior synonym of *Zygethobius* Chamberlin, 1903 (NEW SYNONYMY).

R. E. Crabill, Jr., *Department of Entomology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.*